



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,516	10/08/1999	SUSAN R. SALL	450.268US1	6265

24333 7590 04/07/2003

GATEWAY, INC.
ATTN: SCOTT CHARLES RICHARDSON
610 GATEWAY DRIVE
MAIL DROP Y-04
N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049

EXAMINER

LEWIS, DAVID LEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

13

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/416,516	Applicant(s) Sall
Examiner David L. Lewis	Art Unit 2673

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 31, 2003

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

6) Other: _____

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention

2. Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus type claim. The applicant has included two claims numbered 35, which is confusing and indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. **Claims 1, 13, 23, 29, 33, 34, 35a, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Gouko (6222507 B1).**

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

5. **As in claims 1, 13, 23, 33, and 34, Gouko teaches** of a display comprising: a primary display device for a computer for displaying primary information from an application running on the computer, **figure 1 item 2**; and at least running on the computer, **figure 1 item 1**; and at least one secondary display device for the computer, the at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the computer and stored in a housing adjacent to the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display tertiary information from the application, **figure 2 item 3, column 5 lines 34-60**. Wherein Gouko teaches of a display application wherein a plurality of images are displayed in respective display panels, divided into one display panel.

6. **As in claim 35a, Gouko teaches** of wherein the tertiary information comprises tools for the application, column 5 lines 12-23 and 49-55, wherein a know said computer desktop work area comprises icons or menus for the respective application. **As in claim 38, Gouko teaches** of wherein the at least one secondary display device is extended from a side of the housing, figure 2. **As in claim 29 and 39, Gouko teaches** of wherein the at least one secondary display device includes a first secondary display device extended from a side of the housing and a second secondary display device extended from a top of the housing, figure 6.

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

7. **As in claim 40, Gouko teaches** of a system comprising: a computer, **figure 1 item 1**; a primary display device operatively coupled to the computer for displaying primary information associated with an application running on the computer, **figure 1 item 2**; and at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the primary display device and stored in a housing behind the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display tertiary information associated with the application, **figure 2 item 3, column 5 lines 34-60**. Wherein Gouko teaches of a display application wherein a plurality of images are displayed in respective display panels, divided into one display panel.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 35b, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gouko (6222507 B1) in view of Failla (5128662).**

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

10. **As in claims 35b, 36, and 37, Gouko fails to teach of said spring loaded switch providing a conductive path for a reconfiguration signal the secondary display, however any known mechanism for making the device feature operable wherein the secondary display is extended from behind the primary display would have been obvious design choice to the skilled artisan. Said conductive path and reconfiguration are inherent the device of Gouko. Said spring load switch feature represents a known display housing interfacing component for connecting segmented displays and would have been an obvious design choice in the implementation of the device as taught by Gouko. Failla teaches of a similar segmented display for a computer wherein spring loaded switching, ribbon cable connection, and inverter board features are utilized to implement the system display, column 8 lines 40-60, figures 7, 13, 17. Therefore the spring loaded switch of Faila would have been an obvious design choice for implementing the device as taught by Gouko given said features are known for use in connecting component segmented display, as found in claims 35b, 36, and 37.**
11. **Claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 13, 16, 17, 23, 24, 27, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Rebeske (2950381).**
12. **As in claim 33, Rebeske teaches of a display comprising: a primary display device for a computer for displaying information from a session, figure 4 item 64; and at least one secondary display device for the computer, figure 4 item 70, the at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to**

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

the computer and stored in a housing adjacent to the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display further information from the session, **figure 4 item 77, column 3 lines 11-30, column 4 lines 5-21.**

13. **As in claims 1, 13, and 23, Rebeske teaches of** a display apparatus, method, and system comprising: a primary display device for a computer for displaying a first set of information, **figure 4 item 64;** and at least one secondary display device for the computer, the at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the computer and stored in a housing adjacent to the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display a second, different set of information for the computer, **figure 4 item 70, column 3 lines 11-30.** **Wherein the exclusion of information provided on the first screen from the second screen makes the second screen a different set of information from the first, given they are no longer the same.** The word “different” is interpreted as meaning not the same, or not equal.

14. **As in claim 2, Rebeske teaches of**, wherein the at least one secondary display device is operatively coupled to the primary display device, **figure 4 item 73.** **As in claim 6, 16, 17, and 27 Rebeske teaches of**, wherein the at least one secondary display device is extended from a side of the housing, **figure 4 item 77.** **As in claim 12, Rebeske teaches of**, further comprising at least one hinge coupling the at least one secondary display device to the housing, **figure 4 item 73.** **As in claim 24,**

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

Rebeske teaches of, further comprising storing the at least one secondary display device behind the housing for the primary device, **figure 4, column 4 lines 5-21**.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. **Claims 22, 25, 26, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rebeske (6295038) in view of Hendry et al. (5682529).**

17. **As in claims 22 and 30-32, Rebeske teaches of a system comprising: a computer, figure 1 item 1; a primary display device operatively coupled to the computer, figure 2 item 2a; at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the primary display device and stored in a housing behind the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display information for the computer, figure 2 item 3 and 4, column 1 lines 58-66, column 2 lines 1-48. However Rebeske is silent as to said reconfiguration**

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

module located in the computer wherein the reconfiguration module is initiated when the at least one secondary display device is extended from the housing. **Hendry et al. teaches of a reconfiguration module**, figure 1 item 22, wherein the display manager within the operating system provides communication between each of the software or hardware components, to dynamically configure the plurality of display devices, column 3 lines 29-67, column 5 lines 55-67, column 6 lines 1-13. Further wherein Hendry et al. teaches this reconfiguration may occur automatically as a result of detecting the connection or disconnection of a device from the computer, for example upon insertion into or removal from a docking station, or the pivoting of a monitor from a portrait position to a landscape position. An example of a structure for a display notification is illustrated in Hendry et al.'s figure 3, wherein upon the rearrangement of the display system as taught by Rebeske, said notification would be shown to the user for input and or notice of said reconfiguration. Rebeske clearly teaches of a display devices within the scope of the invention as suggested by Hendry et al. **Therefore it would have been obvious** to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify the computer display device as taught by Rebeske by utilizing the display manager connected to computer hardware aspects of the device as a reconfiguration module by including software as suggested by Hendry et al. to reconfigure the display systems upon extending a display from the housing for purposes of expanding the display view, because Hendry et al. suggests the need for said reconfiguration in a computer display system with one or more display devices, as **found in claims 22, and 30-32.**

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

Further claims 25 and 26 would have been obvious to the skilled artisan for the same reasons of obviousness as applied to claims 22, and 30-32.

18. **Claims 2-5, 7-11, 14, 15, 18-21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rebeske (6295038) in view of Failla (5128662).**
19. **As in claims 2-5, 14, and 15, and claims 7-10, 18-20 and 28 Rebeske teaches of the devices as applied above to claims 1, 13 and 23. However Rebeske is silent as to the specifics of said spring loaded switching, cable connection, and inverter board features. Said features however represent well known display housing interfacing components for connecting segmented displays and would have been an obvious design choice in the implementation of the device as taught by Rebeske. Failla teaches of a similar segmented display for a computer wherein spring loaded switching, ribbon cable connection, and inverter board features are utilized to implement the system display, column 8 lines 40-60, figures 7, 13, 17. Each of said features would have been obvious to the skilled artisan given their well known use in the art for the implementation of such displays as suggested by Rebeske and Failla, as found in claims 2-5, 14, 15, and claims 7-10, 18-20, and 28. As in claims 11 and 21, Rebeske teaches of said invention as applied above to claims 1 and 13, however Rebeske is silent as to said plural secondary displays being extended from a top and side of said display. Failla teaches of an alternative embodiment where secondary displays are hingeably connected to a primary display**

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

for the purpose of increasing the view of a primary display. Given that the primary display of Rebeske includes more information than the secondary display, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to provide and additional hangably connect display or displays extending form the side of the primary display as suggested by Failla, modified by the extension from behind the primary display as taught by Rebeske, for the purpose of increasing the display area of the primary and information intense display, as found in claim 11 and 21.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/31/2003 with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are not persuasive. Rebeske teaches of displays with substantially the same information being displayed, but none the less the information on the displays is not totally the same. Rebeske utilizes software programing and therefore an interface to control features of permitting the operator to exclude certain non-essential display matters on the second display screen while leaving those display matters on the first screen. Given the word different means "not the same", Rebeske teaches of a first and second display with a different set of information on each display. Even "substantially the same" can be interpreted as different. The rejection is maintained in view of the broad interpretation of the word different. Naturally this feature of Rebeske would have to provide a display reconfiguration screen or interface as suggested by Hendry et al. to control making the first and second display

Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices

substantial but not the same. Rejection Maintained. Further Gouko teaches of said claimed invention as found in the new claims rejection.

Conclusion

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **David L. Lewis** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-3026**. The examiner can normally be reached on MT and THF from 8 to 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached on (703) 305-4938. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600